IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE T.MEENA KUMARI

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 6390 of 1995

Between:

1.S.Pratap Reddy, s/o Ram Reddy (late), aged 47 years, Occupation Agriculture.

2.S.Yadav Reddy, s/o Ram Reddy (Late),aged 45 Years,Occupation Agriculture

3 S.Sudershan Reddy, s/o Ram Reddy (Late),aged 42 years, Occupation Agriculture

4 S.Malla Reddy, s/o Ram Reddy (Late), aged 39 years, Occupation Agriculture.

5. Smt S.Venkatamma, w/o Ram Reddy (Late), aged 70 years, Occupation Agriculture.

All are residents of H.No.2-2-281, Amberpet, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1.Government of Andhra Pradesh, rep., by the Secretary to

Government, Land Revenue, Secretariat, Hyderabad.

2.The Commissioner, Urban Land Ceilings, Hyderabad.

3.The Special Officer-cum-Competent Authority, Urban Land

Ceiling,Hyderabad.

4.The Mandal Revenue Officer, Musheerabad Mandal, Hyderabad

District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an appropriate writ or order more particularly in the nature of Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondent Nos.1 to 3 herein to drop all proceedings under the provisions of Urban Land (Ceilings & Regulation) Act of 1976 after holding that the land covered by S.Nos.37,38 and 39 of Amberpet is not vacant land as defined under Section2 Q (1) of the said act and direct the respondent No.4 herein not to collect any penal assessment from the petitioners herein under the provisions of Land Encroachment Act of 1905 and pass any other order or orders in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for the Petitioners: MR.V.MADHAVA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 4: GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

When the matter came up for hearing on 04-11-2004, none appeared, nor any representation is made on behalf of the petitioners. Hence the matter was directed to be listed under the caption ‘for dismissal’. Even today, when the matter is called, none appears nor any representation is made on behalf of the petitioners.

Hence, the writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

25-11-2004

rkk

To

1.The Secretary,Government of Andhra Pradesh,

Land Revenue, Secretariat, Hyderabad.

2.The Commissioner, Urban Land Ceilings, Hyderabad.

3.The Special Officer-cum-Competent Authority, Urban Land

Ceiling,Hyderabad.

4.The Mandal Revenue Officer, Musheerabad Mandal, Hyderabad

District.

5. Two CC to GP for Revenue, High Court buildings, Hyderabad (OUT)

6. Two CD copies.